

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/764,220	01/19/2001	Bum-hee Lee	1293.1161	7430	
21171 75	90 10/19/2006		EXAMINER		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			LANEAU, RONALD		
SUITE 700	RK AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO			3714		
			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/7	764,220	LEE, BUM-HEE	LEE, BUM-HEE			
		Exa	miner	Art Unit				
		i i	ald Laneau	3714				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears o	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAnsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commular period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply well received by the Office later than three months after a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE C 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nication. Itory period will apply ill, by statute, cause t	OF THIS COMMUI in no event, however, may and will expire SIX (6) M the application to become	NICATION.  y a reply be timely filed  IONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 24 July 200	<i>96</i> .					
, —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.								
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or elect	ion requirement.	-				
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to t	by the Examine	er. Note the attach	ned Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	r foreign priorit	ty under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority do	cuments have bee	en received in this National	Stage			
	application from the Internationa		, ,,					
* S	see the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the	certified copies n	ot received.				
Attachmen	· ·			_				
1)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO	7-948)		w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🛛 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>06222006</u> .		of Informal Patent Application					

Art Unit: 3714

## Response to Amendment

1. The response filed on 7/24/06 has been entered. Claims 1-19 remain rejected.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh, et al. (2001/0056377 AI) in view of Moore (6,330,575 B1) and further in view of Brohoff (US 6,108,533).

Kondoh teaches an integrated Internet shopping mall management system (2-cybermallserver) wherein product order information is received at a cyber agency shopping mall (8-cyber shop information through 83 and 84), corresponding to an off-line agency which a customer selects, and the offline agency delivers the ordered product (31 and [0165]- in combination with), the shopping mall management system comprising:

A customer web browser that receives product order information and payment information from the customer and provides the product order information and payment information through Internet (Fig. 1-12; [0165]);

An agency web browser that receives agency product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information (Fig. 1 - 31 utilizing 7);

Art Unit: 3714

A shopping mall web server that forms a cyber agency shopping mall for each of a plurality of agencies; provides the agency product information received from the agency web browsers, corresponding to respective cyber agency shopping malls, to the customer web browser; and receives the order information from the customer web browser through the Internet (Figs. 1, 2, 4 and 5 [0001], [0044]-[0212]; and

A payment server that receives order information from the shopping mall web server and, after receives the payment information from the customer web browser through the Internet, handling the payment information for the order [0148]-[0212].

Kondoh teaches that the purchasing process has been preset in the mall and that process after the information was received are outside the scope of the invention and are not described in detail. Arguably, Kondoh teaches a payment server, i.e. the shopping cart system as it fulfills all the functions as set forth in the claims. Kondoh does not teach that the agency, web browser receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information. Moore teaches an agency web browser that receives product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information though the Internet and displays the paid order information (cols. 4-9). Assuming arguendo, that Kondoh does not teach a payment server, Moore teaches the use of a payment server, i.e. a transaction server in a distributed environment (multiple stores utilizing the same transaction server) (cols. 4-9). Moore teaches that it is complex and expensive to set up an ecommerce server, including that the initial cost is a significant barrier for most small businesses, including the cost of software design and implementation, hardware investment capable of running all three elements of an electronic commerce server for one business (hosting the store

Art Unit: 3714

front, maintenance of an inventory and financial database and roll out of a secured Transaction Server); keeping the storefront/catalog up-to-date, providing the ability to easily create, modify and update its own storefront; the requirement to automatically accept secure, electronic forms of payment (cols 2-3, liens 4-20).

Neither Kondoh nor Moore discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies or stores but Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways and for example in fig. 4, there is illustrated examples of different applications within shopping mall. The inquiring party is interested in obtaining information from the geographic database concerning the service area. And specific information will be given as to identifying anyone of the establishments and how to reach that particular establishment, i.e. the location within the shopping mall where the establishment is located (cols. 5-6, line 66 to line 26; fig. 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the information from the geographic database as taught by Brohoff into the combined system of Kondoh and Moore because it would allow a user to identify the location of an establishment with respect to other geographic elements for purposes of supplying it with information from a geographic database.

As per claim 3, Kondoh teaches as set forth above. Kondoh also teaches an agency connecting unit receiving agency product information from an agency web browser through the

Art Unit: 3714

Internet (Fig. 1 - 7, 4, 31, 42), and providing paid order information to the agency web browser through the Internet;

A plurality of cyber agency web servers corresponding to a plurality of offline agencies, that, after receiving the agency product information from the agency connecting unit, provide the information to a connected customer web browser (Fig. 2 -- step 112; [0047-0048]; claim 5]);

A customer order handling unit receiving order information from the customer web browser (Fig. 1 - 84); and

A payment server receiving payment information from the customer web browser and handling the payment information for the order [0148]-[0212].

Kondoh teaches that the purchasing process has been preset in the mall and that process after the information was received are outside the scope of the invention and are not described in detail. Arguably, Kondoh teaches a payment server, i.e. the shopping cart system as it fulfills all the functions as set forth in the claims. Kondoh does not teach that the agency web browser receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information through the agency connecting unit. Moore teaches an agency web browser that receives product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information though the Internet and, displays the paid order information (cols. 4-9). Assuming arguendo, that Kondoh does not teach a payment server, Moore teaches the use of a payment server, i.e. a transaction server in a distributed environment (multiple stores utilizing the same transaction server) (cols. 4-9). Moore teaches that it is complex and expensive to set up an e-commerce server, including that the initial cost is a significant barrier for most small businesses, including the cost of software design and implementation, hardware investment

capable of running all three elements of an electronic commerce server for one business (hosting the store front, maintenance of an inventory and financial database and roll out of a secured Transaction Server); keeping the storefront/catalog up-to-date, providing the ability to easily create, modify and update its own storefront; the requirement to automatically accept secure, electronic forms of payment (cols 2-3, liens 4-20). Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above.

As per claim 4, Kondoh further teaches a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyper link corresponding to at least one web page provided by the plurality of cyber agency web servers, and that connects one of the cyber agency web servers decided by selection information received from the customer web browser, to the customer web browser (Fig. 4; [0030]; Examples 1-4).

As per claim 5, Kondoh teaches that the agency product information includes at least one of a list of products each agency wants to sell and a notice each agency gives to customers (Fig. 6; Example 4).

Method claims 8-10 correspond to computer readable medium claims 13-16, 18-19 and are rejected on the same basis.

4. Claims 2, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh in view of Moore as applied to claims 1, 3, and 8 above, and further in view of Brohoff (US 6,108,533).

Art Unit: 3714

Neither Kondoh nor Moore teaches that the plurality of cyber agencies are divided according to regions in which each offline agency is located but Brohoff discloses a plurality of cyber agencies such that, when the customer selects one of the regions in a map displayed by the cyber agency connecting unity through the customer web browser, the hyper links of all the cyber agency web servers related to the region are displayed, and the customer is enabled to select the cyber agency web server corresponding to the offline agency the customer wants (fig. 3). Furthermore, Brohoff discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies or stores but Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways and for example in fig. 4, there is illustrated examples of different applications within shopping mall. The inquiring party is interested in obtaining information from the geographic database concerning the service area. And specific information will be given as to identifying anyone of the establishments and how to reach that particular establishment, i.e. the location within the shopping mall where the establishment is located (cols. 5-6, line 66 to line 26; fig. 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the information from the geographic database as taught by Brohoff into the combined system of Kondoh and Moore because it would allow a user to identify the location of an establishment with respect to other geographic elements for purposes of supplying it with information from a geographic database.

Art Unit: 3714

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Brohoff fails to disclose "a shopping mall web server that forms a cyber agency shopping mall for each of a plurality of agencies, provides the agency product information received from the agency web browsers corresponding to respective cyber agency shopping malls to the customer web browser organized according to geographic information of the respective plurality of agencies." In response to Applicant's arguments, Brohoff discloses providing a customer with information about the location of a particular store within a shopping mall based on a search done by said customer. In other words, if a customer is looking for a big sale event in a particular store, said customer can actually find the location of the store in said mall using a wireless device. Furthermore, Applicant argues that the information Brohoff is limited to a location of a service but "geographic information for display according to a geographic input received from a connected customer web Browser. In response to Applicant's arguments, the customer requests information from using a web browser and said information is being displayed for the customer on his/her mobile terminal. Applicant further argues that Brohoff fails to disclose "a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyperlink corresponding to at least one web page..." In response to Applicant's arguments, the customer uses an hyperlink to actually connect and request information about a store within a shopping center. The Examiner believes that Brohoff discloses such limitations of the claimed invention and further Kondoh discloses such elements of the claims (see previous arguments).

Art Unit: 3714

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 6.

examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6788. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Laneau
Primary Examiner 10/4/06

Art Unit 3627

rl